

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
COUNTY OF GRANDE PRAIRIE NO. 1
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA
HELD AT COUNTY OF GRANDE PRAIRIE NO. 1
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MONDAY FEBRUARY 11, 2013
10:00 a.m.

PRESENT	<p>CHAIRMAN L. BEAUPRE</p> <p>COUNCILLORS H. BULFORD M. ECKSTROM P. JACOBS B. SMITH S. NELSON R. SUTHERLAND</p> <p>ABSENT R. HARPE L. DUECK</p> <p>COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR W. A. (BILL) ROGAN</p> <p>SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS HERB PFAU</p> <p>DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES ARLEN MILLER</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE SERVICES MANAGER SHIRLEY FELDBERG</p> <p>RECORDING SECRETARY AMANDA ORAVEC</p>
MEDIA	<p>AARON HINKS BRAD WISKER JEFF HENSEN</p> <p>DAILY HERALD TRIBUNE BIG COUNTRY FM FREE FM</p>
CALL TO ORDER	The meeting was called to order at 10:01 a.m. with the singing of O Canada.
ADDITIONS TO AGENDA AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA	<p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> that the Agenda be adopted as circulated.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-108-13</p>
PUBLIC HEARING: PT. SE 4-72-5-W6M-AG TO RM-1 (FILE PLLUB20120793)	<p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate part of SE 4-72-5-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Rural Industrial (RM-1) District.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-109-13</p> <p>Councillor Nelson declared a pecuniary interest as the applicant is her brother and excused herself from the Public Hearing at 10:03 a.m.</p> <p>The Public Hearing commenced at 10:03 a.m.</p>

Anna Martin, Intermediate Planner, noted that this application is to amend the County Land Use Bylaw by re-designating approximately 4.5 hectares (11.12 acres) of part of SE-4-72-5-W6M from Agricultural (AG) District to Rural Light Industrial (RM-1) District to allow for subdivision of one lot for Industrial use.

This lot is to be the second parcel out of the quarter, and has a Farmland Assessment rating of about 53%. In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 8.3 are most applicable. The application is consistent with the MDP.

In the context of the Inter-municipal Development Plan (IDP), this application is consistent with regard to zoning as the site is located in an area identified as future industrial/commercial use. This application is, however, inconsistent with section 6.4.4 with regard to the sizing of the lot. The IDP states that "subdivisions of up to three industrial parcels (maximum ten acres in size unless there are valid planning reasons for a larger size) per quarter may be permitted with private services", and the applicants are applying for an 11.12 acre lot. In this case, the size of the lot is only marginally larger than the 10 acres mentioned, and there is only one other lot created in the quarter section, therefore the maximum subdivision of 30 acres out of a quarter section has not been met.

In addition to this, we have circulated the application to the City and have not received any concerns. This application was also circulated to County Public Works who have stated that if approved, 5m of road widening will be taken along the eastern boundary of the quarter section, and a 15m x 15m corner cut off will be required along the south eastern corner of the quarter section. This application was also circulated to adjacent landowners, and no objections were received.

Bruce Beairsto, Beairsto, Lehnert, Ketchum, commented that this application and re-division has been in the works for a long time; the parcel is completely controlled by AB Transportation.

Reeve Beaupre inquired whether there is a caveat for road widening. Mr. Beairsto responded that there is a caveat for road widening. There was no one from the audience present to speak to the application.

Councillor Eckstrom expressed a couple concerns with the re-designation to an industrial lot as there is still some CR-5 zoning in the area. As well, this is the second parcel out at 53% farmland rating. She cannot support the mixture of industrial and residential that is proposed for that area.

Mr. Beairsto noted that it is the applicant's son that has the residential lot there and the future plan is to change

	<p>all lots to industrial because the value of the land at CR-5 is not as high as it would be having industrial.</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom posed a question to administration in regards to how many quarter sections will be zoned as industrial as she has not heard anything about it all being rezoned to industrial. A zoning map from the IDP was provided as information.</p> <p>All proposed zoning changes will still need approval by Alberta Transportation as the property is adjacent to a provincial highway and this area is also part of the Short Term Annexation area with the City of Grande Prairie.</p>
	<p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at 10:12 a.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-110-13</p>
<p>BYLAW 2680-13-004 PT. SE 4-72-5-W6M-AG TO RM-1</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-004 to re-designate part of SE 4-72-5-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Rural Industrial (RM-1) District to be read a first time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-111-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY P. JACOBS</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-004 be read a second time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-112-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that consent to be given for third and final reading of Bylaw 2680-13-004.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION DEFEATED 02-113-13</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARING: PT. NE-32-72-6-W6M - AG TO CR-2 (FILE PLLUB20120761)</p>	<p>Councillor Nelson returned to the meeting at 10:13 a.m.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate part of NE-32-72-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-114-13</p> <p>The Public Hearing commenced at 10:14 a.m.</p> <p>Anna Martin, Intermediate Planner, noted that the application is to amend the County Land Use Bylaw by re-designating 2 lots of approximately 4.37 hectares (10.50 acres) and 3.71 hectares (9.17 acres) of part of NE-32-72-6- W6M from Agricultural (AG) District to Country Residential (CR-2) District to allow for subdivision of two lots for Country Residential use. Administration recommends that the application be refused.</p> <p>These lots are to be the 3rd and 4th parcel out of the quarter, and the area of land being re-zoned has a</p>

	<p>Farmland Assessment rating of 39.5%. In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 7.3 are most applicable. The application is consistent with the MDP.</p> <p>Discussions with The County Agriculture department has identified that there has been a significant noxious weed (Mayweed infestation) problem on this quarter section. While the noxious weed problem seems to have been managed well in 2012, there are concerns that any additional disturbance of the site, such as the construction of new dwellings, will result in a flush of Mayweed at high infestation levels and will cause the new owners significant issues as they will have to manage the infestation at their own cost.</p> <p>This application has been circulated to Public Works who have stated that both proposed lots are located on low lying land that is prone to spring flooding and that they should not be approved.</p> <p>However, if the application is approved, road widening will be required. Public Works have recommended that the boundary along proposed Lot 2 should be amended so that the northern boundary is located 30m south in order to accommodate a 30m wide access to the balance along Range Road 64 (to the east), and that access to Lot 2 is to come off this road. It is also recommended that a 60m long and 30m wide stub road be constructed to the east of proposed Lot 1, and is to be used to access proposed Lot 1.</p> <p>Administration also recommends that, if this application was approved, the wetlands (including the outlet) along the south eastern corner of the quarter section shall be registered as an environmental reserve easement.</p> <p>The application has been circulated to adjacent landowners; the comments from the landowners speak to issues they have with truck traffic, the wetland that is located there, the agricultural farmland that will be further diminished, and the problems with controlling the noxious weeds.</p> <p>The ERCB has determined that other wells are located in the area; these wells are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m. The ERCB have determined that these pipelines are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed.</p> <p>ATCO Electric commented that a utility right-of-way in the name of ATCO Electric must be registered with the new and existing titles.</p>
--	---

Alberta Environment has commented that this quarter is seeing subdivision resulting in 2 CR parcels. Both are close to water bodies. The Northwest one is close to a watercourse which may have a wetland associated with it east of the creek and in the Northwest corner of the parcel. No activity should be conducted in this area without applying for a Water Act approval. The parcel in the Southeast is bounded on the West side by a wetland. Again, care ought to be taken during development so as not to adversely affect the wetland. In both cases, storm water ought to be properly managed.

Reeve Beaupre commented that the applicant, Brad Harder, had come to Council approximately 6 months ago for proposed land use changes. Mr. Harder responded that the necessary changes were made in regards to preserving the wetlands in order to proceed with the land use changes.

There was no one from the audience to speak to this application.

Councillor Eckstrom requested that the AG department comment on the Weed issue (Sonja Raven, Agricultural Fieldman, is present at the meeting to answer questions). Councillor Eckstrom also posed a question to Public Works about the flooding concerns and whether there can be a building site constructed on the parcels.

Ms. Raven commented that the land was under reclamation order, which has been satisfied by the applicants. Should there be further disturbance to the land the Mayweed will need to be dealt with accordingly. Ms. Raven noted that as long as everyone knows and understands that the weeds are there, they can be managed; but if it was sold to someone who does not know about the weed issue, it will be difficult to manage.

Ms. Martin commented that we can put a caveat on the land title to ensure that any new owners will be aware of the Mayweed issue prior to purchase.

Herb Pfau, Superintendent of Public Works, answered Councillor Eckstrom's question in regards to flooding noting that, based on the foreman's comments, nothing has been received about the 100 year flood plan.

Mr. Harder commented that his family has grown up in this area farming so they know how to deal with controlling the Mayweed. He also noted that his parents will be moving to one of the proposed CR-2 zoned parcels.

Councillor Smith inquired when the reclamation order was implemented. Ms. Raven responded that the order went from 2009-2012; Mr. Harder got a renter that was able to deal with the issue.

Councillor Sutherland posed a question for Administration in regards to the Ecological reserve and if there is a reason why the County did not reserve the outlet as well. Reeve Beaupre responded that the outlet is part of the reserve. Councillor Sutherland noted his objections are with the Mayweed and flooding.

Mr. Harder commented that they have done a consulting study on where the wetlands are located, and on the distributed handout Sections 1 and 5 are not highlighted as wetlands.

Reeve Beaupre asked for 5 minutes so that Council can review the letters that were distributed this morning at 10:27 a.m. by Planning and Development.

Reeve Beaupre posed a question for Mr. Pfau in regards to the flooding, "is it from the outlet across or from the water body on the map?" Mr. Pfau responded that the site was reviewed and noted that it was not necessarily a wetland; their concern is whether there is a good enough footprint to have the building site there as well.

Councillor Nelson commented that this parcel is located in her area, and noted that it is a very low area of land. Wildlife activity is currently being supported, and looking at the whole quarter there are other areas that are higher for building. Councillor Nelson does not support this application. She inquired what time of year the study was conducted; Mr. Harder responded that the study was done on January 25th. Councillor Nelson responded that it is hard to determine the wetlands and low levels in the wintertime.

Councillor Eckstrom commented that there is already development on this quarter; an applicant came in to have subdividing done while there was flooding to the North. Council decided they needed to show site specific building to ensure for the long term plan.

Kathleen Turner, Director of FCSS, entered the meeting at 10:34 a.m.

Reeve Beaupre noted that the applicant is trying to get land use change; therefore Council can give the applicant direction to come back with the site plans.

Councillor Nelson inquired whether the County had insurance claims on development that has gone into low lying areas within the County. Bill Rogan, CAO, commented that he cannot speak to an actual lawsuit, approximately 5-7 years ago was the most recent claim. Reeve Beaupre commented that there was another application for West of the proposed area and Council had recommended site specific building sites prior to the land use change being approved.

Mr. Harder noted that he wanted to utilize the use of as

	<p>much AG land as possible and that is why the application is for the specific parcel. He further noted that they have sold an acreage just North of the proposed area and they have not had any issues with flooding there.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to recess the public hearing until the applicant can come back with information on a site specific building site.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson spoke against Councillor Eckstrom's motion, noting that just because a house can be built there it does not negate the flooding issues.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-115-13</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARING: PT. SE-21-72-6-W6M - AG TO CR-5 (FILE PLLUB20120784)</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate part of SE 21-72-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a County Residential (CR-5) District.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-116-13</p> <p>The Public Hearing commenced at 10:39 a.m.</p> <p>Matt Konowalchuk, Intermediate Planner, noted that the application is to amend the County Land Use Bylaw by re-designating approximately 6.45 hectares (15.94 acres) of part of SE-21-72-6-W6M from Agriculture (AG) District to County Residential (CR-5) District to allow for subdivision of one lot for residential use.</p> <p>The application site is located within the Hamlet of Clairmont and identified as an Urban Area under the Country's Municipal Development Plan (MDP). While the proposed residential is in close proximity to other residential uses, the Future Land Use designates for industrial purposes. There are no foreseen land use conflicts between the single proposed residential use and industrial uses in the area. In the future, it would be pertinent to adopt an Area Structure Plan to reduce potential land use conflicts between residential and industrial use.</p> <p>An adjacent landowner is concerned that the future development could block drainage and create flooding in the spring. A drainage easement placed on title of the new lot would require the new residents to maintain the water course to a predevelopment level, thus alleviate the opportunity to flood.</p> <p>Access to the proposed lot and balance is via Range Road 63. Road widening is required along the east and south boundaries of the quarter section. Road widening along the southern boundary will allow Bauman Road to expand west of Highway 2. There will be a joint approach shared between proposed lot and balance.</p> <p>This lot is the second parcel out of the quarter, and has a</p>

	<p>Farmland Assessment rating of between 48-56%.</p> <p>The ERCB has determined there are other wells are located in the area; these wells are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation and meet the recommended setback distance requirement of 100m. The ERCB determined that these pipelines are licensed as sweet or have an ERCB Level 1 sour designation. For these types of pipelines, there is no regulated setback distance however, the right-of-way must be observed.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre noted that the adjacent landowner letter was not included in the attachment package. Mr. Konowalchuk was unable to locate the letter.</p> <p>Megan Schur, Manager of Parks and Recreation, entered the meeting at 10:45 a.m.</p> <p>Mr. Beirsto commented that the main question is whether there is a building site, as the drainage path/ easement can be accommodated by implementing certain subdivision conditions.</p> <p>There was an adjacent landowner in the audience to speak to the application. Dale Driver lives just east of the proposed lot. He noted that he has been living there for a long time and water runs from East and South downhill through their property then to the West. He noted that because of the snow buildup on the creek they have had to have the snow plowed off by a Bobcat in order to eliminate the flooding. Mr. Driver commented that as long as they keep the waterway open and running he does not have any concerns with the land use changes.</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom noted that based on the comments Mr. Driver, her main concern is stopping the water from going into the wetlands and impacting residents. The application speaks to flooding, but does not have a conclusive solution to deal with the flooding problem.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre responded that the flooding can be mitigated by Subdivision conditions. She asked Public Works if they would like to comment as they would document any issues. Mr. Pfau responded that they want to keep the elevation and protect the landowner with the drainage easement.</p> <p>Councillor Sutherland inquired that if the water run is blocked, will it affect the neighbours to the east. It was noted that it will affect the neighbours to the east if blocked. Mr. Beirsto commented that any blockage can be handled very easily. Councillor Sutherland inquired whether the ditch can be crossed at any time of the year. Battic Marcus, applicant, responded that it is not really a ditch, it is actually a swale and it cannot be crossed at any time of the year. Councillor Sutherland noted that his concern is if something happens to block the drainage ditch.</p>
--	---

Councillor Smith inquired whether constructing the drainage easement will allow anyone to go onto the property at any time. Mr. Beirsto responded that the drainage easement will ensure that the existing situation does not get worse. Councillor Smith is concerned that the landowner to the East, Mr. Driver, may have to hire a Bobcat again to get the creek cleared, and the flooding cannot be solved if the landowner is blocking the drainage easement.

Reeve Beaupre asked for clarification from Public Works whether this has happened before with other applications and what the County of Grande Prairie's position is on this. Mr. Pfau responded that when there is occasional flooding we have entered a property as an emergency; we try and work with the landowner. There can be an easement or a Public Utility Lot (PUL).

Councillor Nelson expressed her concerns with the building site to the North of the drainage ditch. She noted that this parcel is located in her area, and she would like to ask Mr. Driver, who has lived there for 20 years, about the flooding and whether the area is suitable for building. Reeve Beaupre noted that Mr. Driver can only speak to his property and what happens there. Mr. Driver commented that water leaks into the creek, and the better place to build would be to the North not the South. He also spoke to the seeding, flooding, and other land use that takes place in that area.

Councillor Nelson commented that there may be a need for a road if building is done to the North, and inquired whether the road will affect the drainage easement. Mr. Beirsto responded that there would be a large culvert, and if the drainage ditch does get blocked neighbours will not have the right to go on his property, but if they have the easement/subdivision conditions put in place they will be given the right.

Councillor Eckstrom noted her concern because one resident should not have to be in control of managing the drainage; if the property is sold to a new owner they may not have the means to clear the drainage easement. Reeve Beaupre noted that there will be a caveat put on the title so if the land is sold future buyers will be informed of their responsibilities to control the drainage ditch for both lots.

Reeve Beaupre commented that whoever owns the property to the east, it is in their best interests to keep the snow cleared off the creek. Mr. Driver commented that he should not have to absorb the costs for clearing the snow off the creek to allow for adequate drainage to occur because someone else wants to develop their own property.

Councillor Nelson spoke to the road that will have to be

	<p>built; when the road is built, how are they planning on moving the water in the low area that sinks in and seeps there. Mr. Marcus responded that they will have a professional survey done to ensure that there will be appropriate drainage and that it would be his responsibility to keep the option open for neighbours to come on his land whenever they want to in order to have the drainage easement kept clear.</p>
	<p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at 11:09 a.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-117-13</p>
<p>BYLAW 2680-13-008 PT. SE-21-72-6-W6M - AG TO CR-5</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-008 to re-designate part of SE 21-72-6-W6M from an Agricultural (AG) District to a Country Residential (CR-5) District to be read a first time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-118-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY P. JACOBS</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-008 be read a second time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-119-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND</u> that consent to be given for third and final reading of Bylaw 2680-13-008.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION DEFEATED 02-120-13</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARING: PT. NE-9-72-5-W6M – RM-2 TO RM-4 (FILE PLLUB20120772)</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate part of NE 9-72-5-W6M from Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) District.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-121-13</p> <p>The Public Hearing commenced at 11:10 a.m.</p> <p>Matt Konowalchuk, Intermediate Planner, noted that this application is to amend the County Land Use Bylaw by re-designating approximately 12.64 hectares (31.23 acres) of NE-9-72-5-W6M from Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) District to allow for subdivision for Highway Industrial use.</p> <p>The application site is located within the Bacon ASP in the vicinity of the intersection of Highway 43 and Range Road 53. The Bacon ASP indicates the portion of land adjacent to Highway 43 is proposed to be designated as Highway Industrial (RM-4).</p> <p>In order to facilitate the development of these lands for Highway Industrial purposes, it is intended that the area be rezoned to the appropriate district as a prerequisite to the subdivision. This application would allow the zoning to be consistent with the Bacon ASP.</p>

	<p>Road improvements would be required with future subdivision as per Bacon ASP. In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 8.3 are most applicable. The application is consistent with the MDP. The Farmland Assessment rating for the proposed site is between 66-69%.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation commented that the proposed zoning appears to be in keeping with the development concept and proposed zoning of the adopted Bacon Area Structure Plan. As such the department has no concerns regarding the proposed lands use amendment. Subdivision meets the requirements of Section 14(e) of the Subdivision and Development Regulation as such the department may not cause the subdivision proposal to be refused. The developer and the County must address existing and future highway access requirements prior to development occurring on lands rezoned industrial.</p> <p>Chris from Focus Surveys and Randy Glenn from Helix Engineering Ltd. noted that this is a housekeeping type application in order to align with the approved Bacon ASP.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre posed a question about the comments made by Alberta Transportation in regards to addressing future access and the associated costs. Mr. Glenn responded that the traffic impact assessment and other associated studies are being done soon.</p>
	<p><u>MOVED BY P. JACOBS</u> that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at 11:14 a.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-122-13</p>
<p>BYLAW 2680-13-006 PT. NE-9-72-5-W6M – RM-2 TO RM-4</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-006 to re-designate part of NE 9-72-5-W6M from a Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) District to be read a first time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-123-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-006 be read a second time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-124-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that consent to be given for third and final reading of Bylaw 2680-13-006.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 02-125-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-006 to re-designate part of NE 9-72-5-W6M from a Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) District be read a third time and finally passed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-126-13</p>

<p>PUBLIC HEARING: PT. NW-10-72-5-W6M - RM-2 TO RM-4 (FILE PLLUB20120773)</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY R. SUTHERLAND</u> that a Public Hearing be held to hear comments regarding the application to re-designate part of NW 10-72-5-W6M from a Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) District.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-127-13</p> <p>The Public Hearing commenced at 11:16 a.m.</p> <p>Matt Konowalchuk, Intermediate Planner, noted that this application is to amend the County Land Use Bylaw by re-designating 14.01 hectares (34.62 acres) of NW-10-72-5-W6M from Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) District to allow for subdivision for Highway Industrial use.</p> <p>The application site is located within the Bacon ASP in the vicinity of the intersection of Highway 43 and Range Road 53. The Bacon ASP indicates the portion of land adjacent to Highway 43 is proposed to be designated as Highway Industrial (RM-4). In order to facilitate the development of these lands for Highway Industrial purposes, it is intended that the area be rezoned to the appropriate district as a prerequisite to subdivision.</p> <p>This application would allow the zoning to be consistent with the Bacon ASP. Road Improvements would be required with future subdivision as per the Bacon ASP.</p> <p>In the context of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the policies set forth in section 8.3 are most applicable. The application is consistent with the MDP. The Farmland Assessment Rating for the proposed site is about 66%.</p> <p>Alberta Transportation commented that the proposed zoning appears to be keeping with the development concept and proposed zoning of the adopted Bacon Area Structure Plan. As such the department has no concerns regarding the proposed lands use amendment. Subdivision meets the requirements of Section 14(e) of the Subdivision and Development Regulation as such the department may not cause the subdivision proposal to be refused. The developer and the County must address existing and future highway access requirements prior to development occurring on lands rezoned industrial.</p> <p>Chris from Focus Surveys and Randy Glenn from Helix Engineering Ltd. noted that this is a housekeeping type application in order to align with the approved Bacon ASP. There was no one from the audience to speak to the application.</p>
	<p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that the meeting come out of Public Hearing at 11:20 a.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-128-13</p>

<p>BYLAW 2680-13-007 PT. NW-10-72-5-W6M - RM-2 TO RM-4</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-007 to re-designate part of NW 10-72-5-W6M from a Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) be read a first time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-129-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-007 be read a second time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-130-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> that consent to be given for third and final reading of Bylaw 2680-13-007.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 02-131-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that Bylaw 2680-13-007 to re-designate part of NW 10-72-5-W6M from a Rural Medium Industrial (RM-2) District to Highway Industrial (RM-4) be read a third time and finally passed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-132-13</p>
<p>INTRODUCTION OF C/SUPT. BRENDA LUCKI</p>	<p>Arlen Miller, Director of Community Services, introduced Chief Superintendent Brenda Lucki.</p> <p>Council welcomed Mrs. Lucki to the County of Grande Prairie.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC PLANNING PRIORITIES REVIEW – GRANDE PRAIRIE / BEAVERLODGE DETACHMENT</p>	<p>Reeve Beaupre asked Council’s permission to move this item up on the agenda so Enforcement Services can address all of their items in succession.</p> <p>Superintendent Ray Noble, Officer In Charge, Grande Prairie/ Beaverlodge Detachment, discussed that there are 2 parts to the strategic planning. They are looking at a long term strategic plan as well as a draft of an environmental scan.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre inquired whether they wanted Council to appoint an Administrative member for the strategic plan. Superintendent Noble noted that their goal is to have a 10-12 year strategic plan, and that they are anticipating the need for more members as time goes on.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre inquired if the plan would include using numerous agencies like was done a few years ago. Superintendent Noble responded that the new plan will include looking at detachment needs as well as the needs of other departments and agencies within the County of Grande Prairie.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson commented that she is pleased to hear about the strategic plan and that she has had ratepayers come to her and discuss the effectiveness of police reporting in small communities (for example Clairmont and the report a drug house hotline). They are producing very good outcomes</p>

	<p>Councillor Eckstrom posed a question for Administration about whether the appointment for the strategic planning can be filled by someone in the Community Services department.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to have Administration supply an individual from the Community Services Division to represent the County in developing the strategic plan for the Grande Prairie/Beaverlodge RCMP detachments.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson commented that someone from Council should be appointed to the strategic planning as well to provide more perspectives.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-133-13</p>
<p>POLICE INFORMATION CHECKS</p>	<p>Reeve Beaupre noted that Option 3 is the best option, and that it had been discussed with Bernie House, previous Director of Community Services, prior to his retirement.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to approve Option 3, where County/Provincial residents are provided a distinct application form that provides the option of receiving the service without fee on conditions that a) the service is noticeably slower, and b) they have to pick the final documentation up at another location (Beaverlodge detachment or County Community Services Building).</p> <p>Question of whether or not the County of Grande Prairie can have this in all detachments.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson commented that she has recently had a criminal check done and there were very long lineups, she believes that moving forward the County should offer this service in house at the Community Services building. She believes this should be a service that the County of Grande Prairie should be providing.</p> <p>Councillor Sutherland commented that he does not like the different rates for different people as it creates a class divide. Reeve Beaupre responded that this is a City of Grande Prairie Bylaw.</p> <p>Superintendent Noble commented that the long term issues will be addressed within the strategic plan, and this is just a short term solution. Mr. Miller commented that the County is open to trying this option out for 6 months then reassessing what can be done on the expiration of that period.</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom commented that because this is proposed for a 6 month trial period, during that time Administration can investigate the actual costs of providing the service; this will incur extra costs, but will show issues that may arise (staffing, RCMP involvement).</p>

	<p>Councillor Smith commented that this is a good interim solution for now and Council should pass Option 3.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson posed a question to Superintendent Noble in regards to the \$15 charge; will there be any financial benefits if Council approves Option 3. Superintendent Noble responded that there has been no financial analysis done, but he believes it will not be financially beneficial when accounting for all associated costs. Bill Rogan commented that the fee is more so for offsetting Administrative costs than for making profits.</p> <p>Superintendent Noble commented that at one point the checks were not done as often but now they are done much more often for jobs, volunteering, etc.</p> <p>Council returned to the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-134-13</p>
<p>APPOINTMENT: KIDSPORT- BETHE GOLDIE</p>	<p>Bethe Goldie was asked to come back to Council and present on what the grant from Community Assistance was used for.</p> <p>Councillor Bulford left at 11:55 a.m. and returned at 11:58 a.m.</p> <p>Ms. Goldie discussed that KidSport helps children from financially disadvantaged families participate in sports. They determine from applications that the child is in need of assistance and then contribute \$300 per child; they can either use the funding for one sport or use for more sports if the registration fees are not too high.</p> <p>Kidsport provides funding for children's sports from West of BC border, East to Ridge Valley, North to Spirit River, and South to Grovedale. They are mainly a group of volunteers, but with help from the United Way they have been able to hire a part-time administrative assistant.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson inquired how many applicants had applied to KidSport, how many children were not given funding, and how much funding was provided overall.</p> <p>Ms. Goldie responded that athletes must be 18 or under and that the child must be registered before KidSport sends any money out. For 2012 there were 273 applications, 246 were approved (123 male and 123 female), and 27 were declined. Total funds for 2012 were \$48,394.54; registration accounted for \$47,254.54, and equipment accounted for the remaining \$1140.00.</p> <p>Ms. Goldie showed a breakdown of where the applicants were from and the sports that they used the funding for. Most of the applicants are from Grande Prairie (209) the rest are divided up by the hamlets and towns within the County of Grande Prairie. Hockey is the #1 sport that children used the funding for, followed by gymnastics.</p>

	<p>Reeve Beaupre inquired whether organizations have been willing to help out with equipment if they can. Ms. Goldie responded that hockey groups have been the best for helping with equipment because after they pay the \$300 for registration the children still require all of the necessary equipment for safety.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson inquired whether the 209 Grande Prairie applicants are all living within the City or if some are from the County as well. Ms. Goldie responded that some would be from the County; the numbers are based on the address provided on application.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre thanked Ms. Goldie for coming to Council and presenting and she left at 12:06 p.m.</p>
<p>RECESS</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> to recess for lunch at 12:08 p.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-135-13</p>
<p>RECONVENE</p>	<p>The meeting reconvened at 1:34 p.m.</p>
<p>MINUTES: JANUARY 14, 2013</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> the minutes from January 14, 2013 be approved with amendments noted by Councillor Smith.</p> <p>Councillor Smith noted an issue with a motion he made on January 14, 2013 minutes. Motion to change the grant application: his intent was to have the County carryover money listed in cash value and what the remaining balance is (on page 71 of attachments).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-136-13</p>
<p>FLAG PROTOCOL POLICY B18</p>	<p>Bill Rogan commented that the County flag was lowered for a long time because of retired Councillor Ed Czerniawsky's memorial service being delayed.</p> <p>Administration will have the policy note that the amount of time a flag is lowered should be three days.</p> <p>Shirley Feldberg, Manager of Legislative Services, asked for a resolution to add June 23rd National Day of Remembrance for Victims of Terrorism to the flag policy.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> to add June 23 for the Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism to the dates included in the Flag Protocol Policy B18.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-137-13</p> <p>Councillor Jacobs commented that Councillor Dueck had a concern about the 30+ years for previous Councillors. Reeve Beaupre noted that the policy reflects the changes in past years of service.</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom inquired where it says that the flags</p>

	<p>should be lowered for three days. Mrs. Feldberg responded that three days is just a recommendation to be incorporated into the policy.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> to approve the Flag Protocol Policy B18 and the number of days the flag is lowered to half-mast for past Elected Officials/Councillors of the County be noted as three days.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-138-13</p> <p>Councillor Jacobs commented that Mr. Czerniawsky's wife was very pleased to see that the County flag was lowered in his honour.</p>
<p>BOARD MEMBER COMPENSATION POLICY</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to approve the Board Member Compensation Policy to ensure consistency in how members serving on boards are compensated for their time and travel.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-139-13</p>
<p>AQUATERA BOARD MEMBER RE-APPOINTMENT</p>	<p>Bill Rogan noted that this item was tabled from the February 4, 2013 Council meeting. A letter from Aquatera had been received during Bill's absence, and the County has been sent a cheque for \$9300.00 reimbursing the costs of the installation of the second water meter.</p> <p>Councillor Smith inquired if any members of Council sit on the Aquatera Board of Directors. It was noted that no members of Council sit on the Aquatera Board.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that the County send correspondence to Aquatera approving the appointments of Jim Smith, Dave Urness, and Chris LaBossiere to the Aquatera Board of Directors for a three year term.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson inquired whether Aquatera had asked for new Directors or whether they had no new applicants. Bill Rogan responded that they did have a vacancy on the Board of Directors and they had lots of people apply for the job. Councillor Nelson commented that she would like to see a change in the Board of Directors if there are other applicants for the Board of Directors positions.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre inquired what the maximum term that Directors can sit on the board. Bill Rogan responded that initially there were 1, 2, and 3 year terms, the current term being three years. Council returned to the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-140-13</p>
<p>AAMDC SPRING CONVENTION</p>	<p>The AAMDC Spring Convention is scheduled for March 19 & 20, 2013, at the Shaw Conference Centre in Edmonton.</p> <p>Mr. Miller noted that this is an annual request. The Western Alberta District RCMP has asked if the County Council or</p>

	<p>representatives are interested in scheduling a meeting with the Commanding Officer of the RCMP and representatives from the Justice and Solicitor General's Office, during the convention.</p> <p>If a meeting is desired, a list of topics to be presented is requested in advance, to be sent through the District Office. The District Commander, Chief Superintendent Brenda Lucki, may also request a meeting prior to the conference to allow a pre-discussion of the topics, and perhaps resolve any concerns.</p> <p>A response is requested by February 13, 2013, at the District Office.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre commented that it would be very good for Council to meet and thank them for implemented programs.</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom inquired whether we have talked to the RCMP in regards to working together to get resolutions that are beyond their mandate; for example, traffic safety on Highway 43 because it is affecting both ratepayers and the RCMP. Reeve Beaupre inquired what the mandate is for the Western Alberta District RCMP.</p> <p>Mr. Miller responded that traffic safety can be added to the list of topics for discussion, but unfortunately traffic issues are addressed by a different officer. He noted that he can talk to the Commanding Officer in regards to traffic safety.</p> <p>Mr. Miller further noted that Council may not get a meeting with the CO of the RCMP if our issues do not have priority. Reeve Beaupre inquired if the Commissioner will be coming to the Growing the North Conference. Mr. Miller responded that he will be flying in the day before, and he has asked that Council has a chance to meet with him.</p>
<p>SASKATOON MOUNTAIN PLAN FOR RECREATION AND CONSERVATION</p>	<p>Ms. Schur began her presentation at 1:54 p.m.</p> <p>Saskatoon Mountain has an extensive history as a greenspace and military base. It is suffering the effects of numerous incompatible uses taking place. The County and the Province partnered to create a plan to guide us to protect the area while keeping it a functional recreation resource. Input sessions have been completed and hunting was to be very restricted in this area. However, the ESRD does not want to see hunting restricted too much as there will be issues with problem wildlife.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 - Received final version of the Plan from O2 Consulting and Design.</p> <p>November 23, 2012 - Met with Calvin McLeod of the Provincial Tourism Parks and Recreation Department</p>

(TPR). Mr. McLeod advised that TPR needs to conduct a land assembly to define the boundary of parcel and give it one designation. TPR is in support of the majority of the recommendations in the Plan with a few exceptions. They are in support of re-designating the area as a Provincial Recreation Area and working together to create a conceptual plan for future usage and development.

January 18, 2013 - Meeting of the Parks Committee to discuss the plan and make a recommendation to Council.

The recommendations are as follows:

The Parks Committee recommends that Council formally accept the Plan as developed by O2 Consulting and Design. The committee also requests that Council support the following recommendations:

- Encourage the Provincial Tourism Parks and Recreation department to complete a land assembly to define the boundaries of the Saskatoon Mountain Natural Area.
- Support the Tourism and Parks department to re-designate the Natural Area as a Provincial Recreation Area under the Provincial Parks Act.
- Direct Administration to work with TPR to determine costs associated with developing a conceptual plan for the area that will include designated usage zones, trails and a campground.
- Direct Administration to bring information forward to Council as it progresses.

Administration recommends Option 1 to support the recommendations of the Parks Committee in whole with regular reporting.

Reeve Beaupre expressed her concerns with two Ministries trying to accomplish the same thing, and inquired whether Parks and Recreation has had a discussion with ESRD. She also asked that the terminology be consistent between different parks and different land use areas and inquired whether there has been consultation with other Administrative staff for Kleskun Hills, Bear Lake, and other parks.

Ms. Schur commented that O2 had mainly focused on user groups for input in the area. She had recently received an email from Administration with TRP department to meet about Off Highway Use Vehicles, and she noted that they have not had their concepts confirmed yet either. There will be opportunity for them to meet and discuss at the next meeting in order to develop consistent concepts and language.

Councillor Nelson commented that by having it as a natural area designation it promotes community ownership, and that people in that area don't like what is currently happening there. She also inquired whether the intent is to move the ownership to Albertans in general and if they are offering caretaker services to have policing and protection.

Ms. Schur responded that they want to ensure that the will be strictly for all Albertans; TPR had discussed having a caretaker there as a necessity but they are not sure who will be paying for the caretaker services yet.

Reeve Beaupre requested clarification on whether there have been discussions on who will build the campground on a contractual basis, enforcement, etc. Ms. Schur responded that there has not been an in depth discussion yet, they have just discussed that it should be done.

Ms. Schur commented that a 35 site campground would be decent size but TPR said that for a much smaller cost they could up it to a 100 site campground in order to generate more revenue.

Councillor Jacobs discussed her concerns with people who say that the natural area is already too far gone and cannot be conserved. She noted that she is not happy with the people working for TPR as they do not necessarily care about conserving the area; we need to have a plan in place before the natural area designation is zoned.

Reeve Beaupre commented that she agrees with Councillor Jacobs, she noted that land uses for the Wapiti Dunes area have not been approved because people are not listening to the individuals that are directly affected by the zoning and designation changes.

Councillor Jacobs noted that she is supportive of the recommendations pending clarification of exactly what they mean; she wants to know what usage they are committing to. Bill Rogan responded that this will need to be a collaboration as the Provincial government will not be giving money for the site as it is Community driven and managed.

Councillor Jacobs commented that she is not happy with the plan for 100 campsites because she is unsure that the County will be able to recoup the money once we have put it out for construction.

Ms. Schur commented that the Parks Committee is in support of accepting the plan, but commented that Council can amend the recommendations to also gather more information in regards to the conceptual plan. She also noted that there will be motorized usage on the east and non-motorized usage on the west.

Councillor Nelson commented that this is a visionary plan,

	<p>and therefore it should focus on protecting the flora and fauna as well. Ms. Schur responded that the protection is in the plan, it is Recreation but also Conservation; it may not be shown in these recommendations but it is included in the overall plan.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY P. JACOBS</u> to accept the plan as presented but seek clarification in regards to the location of the environmental reserves, Tourism Parks and Recreation's commitment, as well as having regular progress reports brought back to Council.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-141-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY P. JACOBS</u> to have Administration set up a meeting with the new Minister of Tourism, Parks and Recreation to discuss the above items.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-142-13</p>
<p>PROPOSED POLICY J4</p>	<p>The County of Grande Prairie has had CPIC access services provided to their Peace Officers through the RCMP since 1977. It is understood by the County that CPIC access is necessary for Police and Peace Officers to safely and legally conduct their duties.</p> <p>Effective April 1, 2013, the Province of Alberta will provide CPIC access to participating and authorized Level 1 Community Peace Officers.</p> <p>Effective April 1, 2013, the RCMP will no longer be providing CPIC access to Community Peace Officers.</p> <p>Stu Rempel, Manager of Enforcement Services, noted that this policy is not a replacement for other policies it is a new policy.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre provided clarification noting that previously the Peace Officers were getting information through the RCMP but now it will be through the Solicitor General. She also inquired whether there are additional costs because of the additional administrative work. Mr. Rempel responded that Reeve Beaupre is correct and there will be some additional costs due to administration.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre also inquired whether there will be a gap in information because of where the information is obtained. Mr. Rempel responded that they will still be using the same police system but just through a different service provider; they were previously getting information as a third party but this policy will allow the information to be obtained first hand.</p> <p>Councillor Sutherland inquired whether the County is charged per call. Mr. Rempel responded that Enforcement has not been charged anything yet, there may be a fee coming for usage but he will not know of</p>

	<p>the fees until the end of the year. Furthermore, if they can integrate the service into the County there will be no additional fees as long as the entire County of Grande Prairie does not exceed the allotted usage.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTOM</u> to pass and implement Policy J4.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-143-13</p>
<p>MONTHLY STATEMENT FOR NOVEMBER 2012</p>	<p>Councillor Eckstrom inquired about payments to Atomic Crayon; she was informed that the company designed the new website of the County of Grande Prairie. She also inquired what the payment to the City of Grande Prairie for \$17,631.08 was for. Bill Rogan responded that he would look into the payment to the City of Grande Prairie.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to accept the November 2012 monthly statement as information.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-144-13</p> <p>Councillor Jacobs and Reeve Beaupre commented on the Call 2 Order Software system and the agenda attachments; there will be training for Council members at a later date.</p>
<p>CLAIRMONT AND DISTRICT AG SOCIETY- WINTER FESTIVAL</p>	<p>Letter from the Clairmont & District AG Society requesting the County clear access to Clairmont Lake and clear areas for street hockey games as well as horse and wagon rides. The Grande Prairie Motocross Association will be doing a demonstration on the lake and need an area cleared.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> that the County provide any assistance in collaboration with the County Parks and Public Works Departments for the Clairmont and District AG Society Winter Festival in regards to snow removal, subject to the availability of manpower and equipment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-145-13</p>
<p>SEXSMITH CURLING CLUB REQUEST FOR SILENT AUCTION ITEM</p>	<p>Ms. Schur noted that the Sexsmith Curling Club will be holding their Annual Curling Bonspiel February 14-17, 2013. In the past Council have provided a letter of support and a silent auction item for this event.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre commented that it is in the policy that Silent Auction items up to \$150.00 do not have to come to Council for approval.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to provide a silent auction item up to \$150.00 for the Sexsmith Curling Club Annual Bonspiel.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-146-13</p>

<p>IN CAMERA</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> that the meeting go In Camera at 2:34 p.m. to discuss:</p> <p>a) Land Purchase b) Insurance c) Personnel (Verbal)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-147-13</p> <p>Ms. Schur left the meeting at 3:15 p.m.</p>
<p>OUT OF IN CAMERA</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> that the meeting come out of In Camera at 3:25 p.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-148-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to enter into discussions with the landowner to discuss road requirements as indicated by Public Works.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-149-13</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>COUNCILLOR REPORTS</u></p>
<p>BRANDING COMMITTEE MEETING</p>	<p>Councillor Sutherland attended the Branding Advisory Committee meeting.</p>
<p>CANFOR ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE MEETING</p>	<p>Councillor Sutherland attended the CANFOR Environmental Committee meeting.</p>
<p>DINOSAUR MEETING</p>	<p>Councillor Sutherland attended the Dinosaur meeting and commented that Brian Brake will be reporting to Council on February 25th.</p>
<p>AFFARN- AG FOOD AND FIBRE AND APPLIED RESEARCH</p>	<p>Councillor Sutherland attended the AG Food Fibre and Applied Research meeting.</p>
<p>MPC MEETING</p>	<p>Councillor Jacobs attended the MPC meeting.</p>
<p>COUNCIL LUNCHEON</p>	<p>Councillor Jacobs attended the Council Luncheon.</p>
<p>ROUNDAABOUT IN CLAIRMONT</p>	<p>Councillor Jacobs posed a question for Public Works in regards to the roundabout in Clairmont and whether a fire truck was tested to make it around. Mr. Pfau responded that they did test fire trucks on the roundabout and they can drive around slowly or drive over top of the middle because it is concrete.</p>
<p>QUESTION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT ON 72280 RANGE ROAD 53</p>	<p>Councillor Nelson commented that she had nothing to report. She posed a question for Mr. Simpson about 72280 Range Road 53 in regards to business activity. She noted that Planning and Development had approved the</p>

	<p>development where the landowners had a business renovating mobile homes; they were allowed to have two on their property at once. Currently there are six mobile homes as well as trucks and tankers on the property. Councillor Nelson was wondering if this is industrial zoning or still County Residential.</p> <p>Mr. Simpson responded that Councillor Nelson is correct and the landowners are exceeding the current permit; it was not zoned industrial.</p>
<p>FCM CONFERENCE IN VANCOUVER MAY 31- JUNE 3</p>	<p>Councillor Smith commented that the hotel Councillors will be staying in Vancouver for the FCM Conference May 31- June 3, 2013 is located approximately 6 blocks from the Vancouver Convention Centre.</p>
<p>COUNCIL HIGHLIGHTS IN LOCAL NEWSPAPERS</p>	<p>Councillor Smith commented that he thinks the Council Highlights should be published in the local newspaper. He commented that he has been paying for them to be printed in the Hythe Headlines in the past.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY B. SMITH</u> to have Administration come back to Council with an estimate for publishing Council Highlights in the Hythe, Beaverlodge, Sexsmith, and DHT newspapers.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-150-13</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom spoke in favour of the motion, commenting that we should just go ahead and have the highlights printed instead of having Administration research costs and report back to Council.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre responded that the costs for printing may not necessarily be within the budget; the prices will have to be researched and brought back for approval.</p> <p>Councillor Smith commented that the cost for advertisement in the Hythe Headliner went from \$103.00 to \$247.00 so he stopped paying to have the highlights printed.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson spoke against the motion, she commented that she would like to support it as a "test case" but does not think it should happen if the cost will be \$1000/week for all of the newspapers.</p>
<p>COUNCIL LUNCHEON</p>	<p>Councillor Bulford attended the Council Luncheon.</p>
<p>BRANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING</p>	<p>Councillor Bulford attended the Branding Advisory Committee meeting.</p>
<p>BRANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING</p>	<p>Councillor Eckstrom attended the Branding Advisory Committee Meeting. She noted they were shown 6 logos and taglines; her husband had commented that he likes the old logo the best.</p>

<p>TEEPEE CREEK GAZETTE</p>	<p>Councillor Eckstrom noted that she has put the Teepee Creek Gazette in the Reading File. The newspaper included a thank you to the County for their support for the Museum. There was also a thank you from the Teepee Creek AG Events Centre thanking Council for their support and noted that they have raised \$550,000.00 to date inclusive of the \$450,000.00 donation from the County.</p>
<p>GROUP DISCUSSION ON PUBLIC EDUCATION (SHELDON CHUMIR)</p>	<p>Councillor Eckstrom attended a group discussion on Public Education. There were questions about private education facilities (i.e. \$10,000 for private schools, should private schools be publically funded). It was noted that there will be more sessions coming to Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and Fort McMurray.</p>
<p>BRANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING</p>	<p>Reeve Beaupre attended the Branding Advisory Committee meeting.</p>
<p>EMERGING TRENDS IN MUNICIPAL LAW</p>	<p>Reeve Beaupre attended the Emerging Trends in Municipal Law Workshop in Edmonton hosted by Brownlee LLP Barristers & Solicitors. She noted that it was very good conference/workshop. She has put case studies in the Reading File for other Councillors to review.</p> <p>There was lots of discussion on Bylaws as well as a session on Public Utilities and how to encourage investment from for profit companies. Reeve Beaupre spoke to one of the partners and they advised that they are coming to Grande Prairie in March for a Seminar, the City of Grande Prairie will be hosting.</p> <p><u>MOTION BY M. ECKSTROM</u> that Administration contacts the City of Grande Prairie to see if they will permit the County of Grande Prairie Council to attend the Seminar by Brownlee LLP in March 2013.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-151-13</p>
<p>REGIONAL EMS WINE FAIR AND AUCTION</p>	<p>Reeve Beaupre attended the Regional EMS Wine Fair and Auction. She commented that the event was very successful with 500 attendees and they raised \$45,000.00 from the event.</p>
<p>BILL ROGAN, CAO</p>	<p>Bill Rogan noted that he has sent an email reminder to Council about the Inter-municipal meeting. The County will be hosting the meeting.</p>
<p>WAPITI RIVER OPEN HOUSE</p>	<p>Bill Rogan commented that the Wapiti River Open House is being held today (February 11, 2013) at 4:30 p.m.</p>
<p>ELECTION TRAINING</p>	<p>Bill Rogan commented on arranging post-Election Orientation Training with George Cuff as per a previous motion from Council. Mr. Cuff's fee is \$10,000 for the one day workshop and the County can invite other municipal representatives to attend as well. If there is an interest in having Mr. Cuff present to Council they can confirm a date.</p>

	<p>Councillor Jacobs noted confusion about the sessions that have been provided in the past. Bill Rogan responded that the last orientation was for day to day Council operations, this orientation would be to discuss the post-Election Orientation for new Councillors.</p> <p><u>MOTION BY S. NELSON</u> to have Administration schedule a date with George Cuff to come and discuss Council Election Orientation and extend the invitation to the MD of Greenview as well as other municipalities.</p> <p>Councillor Sutherland commented that he agrees with Councillor Jacobs about the orientations, he was not familiar with how the County did business when he first became a Councillor.</p> <p>He further commented that Department Heads need to come and tell Councillors how they proceed with their business (especially Finance). There should be a day or two of meeting with Directors and Finance similar to the one that was done at Evergreen Park. He commented that it is very important to have an overview of County business provided for new Councillors.</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom spoke in favour of Councillor Nelson's motion as there will be at least two brand new Councillors coming in after the election. She also agreed with Councillor Sutherland's comments about having certain departments come to Council to ensure they are familiar with and understand County business.</p> <p>Council returned to the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION DEFEATED 02-152-13</p> <p><u>MOVED BY M. ECKSTROM</u> to have Administration find a facilitator to provide Council and Election Orientation on the roles and responsibilities and extend invites to other municipalities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-153-13</p> <p>Councillor Eckstrom left the meeting at 4:05 p.m. to attend a conference call.</p>
<p>MOUNTAIN PINE BEETLE GRANT</p>	<p>Bill Rogan received notice that the County will receive a Mountain Pine Beetle Grant in the amount of \$160,000.00. There will be some clean up done at Camp Tamarack as well as the Evergreen Park and Dunes areas.</p>
<p>VACATION: FEBRUARY 25-MARCH 1</p>	<p>Bill Rogan noted that he will be on vacation the week of February 25th after the Council meeting returning March 4, 2013.</p>
<p>SEVENTHAVEN GROUP</p>	<p>Reeve Beaupre noted that she had received an inquiry from Don Reimer in regards to the information what was provided in the February 4, 2013 Council Reading File</p>

	<p>from Seventhaven Group.</p> <p>The group wants to discuss fracturing issues within rural Alberta municipalities and they want to make a presentation to Council. Reeve Beaupre noted that another Council has already said that they are not supporting the initiative.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre commented that unless there is specific direction from Council she will contact Mr. Reimer and advise that Council will schedule a date with him at their convenience. The document will also be put back in the Council Reading File for the next Council meeting.</p> <p>Councillor Sutherland inquired how scheduling a meeting with ERCB is progressing. Bill Rogan advised that the meeting is lined up for March and there will be discussion on fracturing legislation. Councillor Smith commented that there should also be discussion on the legislation for protecting well water prior to fracturing.</p>
<p>HERB PFAU, PUBLIC WORKS</p>	<p>Mr. Pfau noted that tenders are going out, they were posted on Thursday; some tenders are also closing soon. There is crushing going on in Pit 3 and the gravel roads are in good condition. He noted that he needs to speak with Councillor Smith after the meeting adjourns.</p>
<p>JOHN SIMPSON, PLANNING</p>	<p>Mr. Simpson noted that next week annexation talks with the City begin; he has not received an agenda yet. The County will have a list of topics to be mediated by the end of this week. Council will need to have a checklist of what we need and what can be negotiated.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre commented that the mediator had wanted her to make an opening statement for the mediations.</p> <p>Councillor Nelson noted that she spoke to a disgruntled landowner whose property will be involved in the annexation. He does not want to be annexed into the City and he attempted to seek legal advice in Grande Prairie but was not successful and sought advice from lawyers in Edmonton. She wanted to note that other ratepayers and landowners who oppose the annexation may not have the means to pursue legal representation and therefore the County should provide information.</p> <p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> to have Administration host an informal meeting so County landowners can come and get advice from the Planning Department in regards to the Annexation areas and issues that they have.</p> <p>Reeve Beaupre commented that direction was given by Council to have Planning distribute a letter to the ratepayers letting them know what is happening. She is worried that if we give ratepayers information on how to precede with the annexation/legal issues we will eventually begin to act as their agent.</p>

	<p>Council returned to the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION WITHDRAWN</p> <p>Councillor Nelson withdrew her motion and commented that she will bring this issue back to Council once mediations have already begun.</p> <p>It was noted that ratepayers need to write letters to the Municipal Government Board stating that they do not want their land to be annexed into the City, however it will be 4-6 months minimum after any annexation application is made before the board begins to proceed with the annexation hearing.</p>
<p>PERSONNEL ITEM</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY H. BULFORD</u> to proceed as discussed in Camera on the Personnel item.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-154-13</p>
<p>COUNCILLOR SUTHERLAND AWAY FEBRUARY 22, 2013</p>	<p>Councillor Sutherland noted that he will be away on February 22nd, 2013 because he will be attending the Opening of Dinosaur construction tender in Edmonton with Brian Brake.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p><u>MOVED BY S. NELSON</u> that the meeting adjourn at 4:25 p.m.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOTION CARRIED 02-155-13</p>
<p>These Minutes</p> <p>Approved this ____</p> <p>Day of _____</p> <p>2013.</p> <p>Reference # _____</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">REEVE</p> <p style="text-align: right;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR</p>